

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, 16-17, 21 and 26 are amended. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0007]-[0010] stating that plural processing units perform service processing operations on the document data; and paragraph [0054] stating that a document is the processing object processed by service processing units. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Zhu during the May 6, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Amendments

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 are amended to recite "wherein ... each of the plural service processing units has access to the entire document data when performing service processing operations on the document data", and claims 16, 21 and 26 are amended to recite "wherein ... each of the at least two service processing devices has access to the entire document data when performing service processing operations on the document data".

II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied References

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19-22, 24-27 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434 to Hower et al. (Hower) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,625,757 to Kageyama, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,711 to Barry et al. (Barry); and (2) rejects claims 3, 8, 13, 18, 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hower, Kageyama, Barry, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,015 to Smith et al. (Smith). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Regarding independent claims 1, 6 and 11, the applied references do not disclose "wherein ... each of the plural service processing units has access to the entire document data

when performing service processing operations on the document data" (emphasis added).

Regarding claims 16, 21 and 26, the applied references do not disclose "wherein ... each of the at least two service processing devices has access to the entire document data when performing service processing operations on the document data" (emphasis added).

Hower discloses a network processing system 10 that includes a plurality of printers 12 (12-1 to 12-n) for outputting print jobs (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-49); and workstations (clients) 15 (15-1 to 15-n) that provide electronic documents to be printed (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 50-54). In operation, a client 15 (e.g., client 15-1) has an electronic job ticket 35 that allows a user to create a print job (col. 4, lines 2-12). The job ticket 35 contains programming parameters for the print job (col. 14, lines 5-7). The system 10 further allows the user to select one of print queues 42 (41-1 to 42-n) (col. 4, lines 28-40), each of which is associated with one of printers 12 (col. 4, lines 40-42).

The Office Action cites to Kageyama as disclosing the claimed "service processing device" and alleges that "subsystems" of Hower can be incorporated into Kageyama.

Kageyama discloses a printing system that includes terminal equipment / clients (e.g., client 11 to client 13), printer server 300 that includes one or more printer / spooler control servers 15, and plural printers (e.g., printer 17 to printer 19) (Figs. 1 and 4). In operation, a client provides a print request to a receiving print service 7300 (Fig. 4) that is printed on one of the printers 17-19.

The Office Action acknowledges that Hogle and Kageyama do not disclose or suggest each of the (at least two) service processing units each performing a different subset of the service processing operations, but cites to Barry as curing this deficiency.

Barry discloses a system having multiple print engines 16 and virtual job routing (Fig. 1). The system includes workstations 10 and processor / distributor 14 (Fig. 1). In operation, print jobs, provided by the workstations, are disassembled by a RIP operation into their

separate pages. Different pages of an original print job can be sent to different print engines 16 where additional processing can occur (col. 10, lines 1-19). As tentatively agreed during the personal interview, Barry discloses, at best, that different printers 16 process, in parallel, different subsets of the original print job.

Because the print jobs are disassembled into separate pages before being sent to printers 16, where they may receive additional processing, Barry does not disclose or suggest each of the plural (or at least two) service processing units (or devices) has access to the entire document data when performing service processing operations on the document data.

Regarding independent claim 21, the applied references do not disclose or suggest "transmitting the script to another service processing device for performing a next service processing operation". Regarding independent claim 26, the applied references do not disclose or suggest "transmitting, after execution of the at least one service processing operation is ended, the script to another service processing device for performing a next service processing operation".

As agreed at the personal interview, Barry operates by disassembling print jobs into their individual pages which are distributed to one or more of the printers 16 which output the individual pages in parallel. Thus, Barry does not disclose or suggest a service processing unit that executes service processing operations of a script on document data and that transmits the script to another service processing unit for performing next service processing operations as recited in the claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/jhb

Date: July 10, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
